

**REMARKS**

**Amended Claims**

Claims 1, 8 and 15 are amended herein.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims recite a computer-usable medium. Applicant traverses this rejection and feels that claims 15-20 are allowable for the following reasons.

In rejecting claims 15-20, the Examiner stated that “[c]laims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed towards non-statutory subject matter. These claims recite a computer-usable medium. Functional descriptive material comprising computer programs or algorithms that impart functionality when employed as a computer component must be embodied on a computer readable medium to impart its functionality (see MPEP 2106.IV.B1(a)).”

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner maintains that claims 15-20 are statutory subject matter.

Applicant notes that the Specification of the Present Application defines a computer-usable medium as “[s]torage device 110 comprises a computer-usable media such as a static random access memory (SRAM), dynamic random access memory (DRAM), a non-volatile memory device, a register, magnetic media, optical media, or the like.” in, at least, Paragraph [0015] of the Present Application. Applicant also notes that claim 15, from which claims 16-20 depend, recites, in part “[a] computer-usable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for execution by a processor to perform a method of error archiving for a device.”

Applicant respectfully maintains that storage devices, static random access memory (SRAM), dynamic random access memory (DRAM), non-volatile memory device, a register, magnetic media, optical media, or the like, are computer components and therefore statutory. Applicant also respectfully maintains that “a computer-usable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon” would be viewed as equivalent to a computer-readable medium by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant also respectfully maintains that MPEP §2106(IV)(B)(1) states that “[d]escriptive material can be characterized as either ‘functional descriptive material’ or

‘nonfunctional descriptive material.’ In this context, ‘functional descriptive material’ consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component.” and that MPEP §2106(IV)(B)(1)(a) further states that “[w]hen a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, Office personnel should treat the claim as a product claim.” Applicant therefore contends that a interpretation of MPEP §2106(IV)(B)(1) and MPEP §2106(IV)(B)(1)(a) as stating that any claim reciting a structure other than a “computer-readable medium” as being non-statutory, as maintained by the Examiner, to be too narrow of an application and contrary to the guidance of MPEP §2106(IV)(B)(1) and MPEP §2106(IV)(B)(1)(a).

As such, Applicant asserts that the relevant features of claims 15-20, in particular, the claiming of “a computer-usable media”, as a statutory claiming of a computer program in conjunction with a physical structure, and described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention. Applicant therefore contends claims 15-20 are statutory and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 15-20 by the Examiner.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 14, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mizutani (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,400). Applicant traverses this rejection and submits that claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 14, 15 and 18, as amended, are allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains that Mizutani teaches a printer system that transmits an electronic copy of the currently generated image from a printer to a client apparatus for display when an error occurs and does not teach or disclose an imaging device that is adapted to compile the error information when an error is detected and store in a storage device the error information for two or more errors. *See*, Mizutani, Figures 1, 3A, 4 and 5A-5C; Column 5, lines 34-47; Column 6, line 52 to Column 7, line 22; Column 7, line 28-67; and Column 8, lines 4-65.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Mizutani fails to teach or disclose an imaging device, comprising a processor adapted to compile error information when an error is detected, wherein the error is based on one or more imaging device processes; a print engine coupled to the processor and adapted to produce tangible output images; and a storage device coupled to the processor, wherein the processor is adapted to store in the storage device the error information for two or more errors for one or more of transmission, retrieval,

and disposal of the error information based on user criteria. As such, Mizutani fails to teach or disclose all elements of claims of the Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, recites "[a]n imaging device, comprising: a processor adapted to compile error information when an error is detected, wherein the error is based on one or more imaging device processes; a print engine coupled to the processor and adapted to produce tangible output images; and a storage device coupled to the processor, wherein the processor is adapted to store in the storage device the error information for two or more errors for one or more of transmission, retrieval, and disposal of the error information based on user criteria." As detailed above, Applicant submits that Mizutani fails to teach or disclose such an imaging device that is adapted to store in the storage device the error information for two or more errors. As such, Mizutani fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 1.

Applicant's claim 8, as amended, recites "[a] method of error archiving for an imaging device, comprising monitoring system operations for the imaging device; and when an error is detected, compiling information about the error into an error file stored on a storage device of the imaging device for one or more of storage, transmission, retrieval, and disposal; wherein the information about two or more errors is stored in the error file." As detailed above, Applicant submits that Mizutani fails to teach or disclose such a method of error archiving for an imaging device. As such, Mizutani fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 8.

Applicant's claim 15, as amended, recites "[a] computer-usable medium having computer readable instructions stored thereon for execution by a processor to perform a method of error archiving for an imaging device comprising: monitoring system operations of the imaging device; and when an error is detected, compiling information about the error into an error file and storing it on a storage device for one or more of storage, transmission, retrieval, and disposal; wherein the information for two or more errors is stored in the error file." As detailed above, Applicant submits that Mizutani fails to teach or disclose such a computer-usable medium and method. As such, Mizutani fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 15.

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1, 8 and 15 as pending have been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited reference. As claims 3, 10, 14, and 18 depend from and further define claims 11, 15 and 21, respectively, they are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allowance of claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 14,

15 and 18.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,400). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 7 is allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Mizutani fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1, from which claim 7 depends from. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Mizutani with the Examiner's taking of official notice of any type of storage device capable of storing data may be utilized fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 1 and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of dependent claim 7, either alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claim 7 depends from and further defines claim 1 it is also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 7.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,400) as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,057). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Mizutani fails to teach or suggest all elements of claims 1, 8, and 15, from which claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 20 depend from, respectively. As such, Applicant respectfully maintains that Mizutani also fails to teach or suggest all elements of claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 20. In addition, Applicant respectfully maintains that Takeda et al. discloses a networked printing system of terminals and printers having error processing that operates in reference to an error code and lookup table and allows print jobs to be re-routed to other printers on the network and sends an error report to the user. *See*, Takeda et al., Figure 20; Abstract; Summary; and Column 6, lines 14-40. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Mizutani with Takeda et al. fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claims 1,

8, and 15, and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 20, either alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1, 8, and 15 as pending have been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 20 depend from and further define claims 1, 8, and 15, respectively, they are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19 and 20.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,400) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Venkatraman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 4 is allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Mizutani fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1, from which claim 4 depends from. As such, Applicant respectfully maintains that Mizutani also fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 4. In addition, Applicant respectfully maintains that Venkatraman et al. discloses an embedded webserver system for networked devices allowing user interface functions to be accessed over a network. *See*, Venkatraman et al., Abstract and Summary. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Mizutani with Venkatraman et al. fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 1, and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of dependent claim 4, either alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claim 4 depends from and further defines claim 1 it is also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 4.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,400) as applied to claim 8 above, in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,057) and further in view of Ohtani (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,099). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 4 is allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Mizutani fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 8, from which claim 11 depends from. As such, Applicant respectfully maintains that Mizutani also fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 11. In addition, Applicant respectfully maintains that Ohtani discloses a networked image forming system having email communication of abnormal conditions to users and administrators. *See*, Ohtani, Figures 4 and 6; Abstract and Summary. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Mizutani with Ohtani fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 8, and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of dependent claim 11, either alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 8 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claim 11 depends from and further defines claim 8 it is also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 11.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2207.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1/9/06



Andrew C. Walseth

Reg. No. 43,234

Attorneys for Applicant  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400